

people and his enemies—the only dictator on Earth who has done so. As our President has said, Saddam Hussein's Iraq is a grave and gathering danger, a clear threat to American security and the security of our friends in the region.

As I just mentioned, Congress must debate the question of war with Iraq. It is appropriate and right for the people of the United States to have their voices heard in this debate through their representatives in Congress. But as the President has said, the nation must speak with one voice once we determine to take a course that will most likely send our nation's young men and women to war.

The President has patiently worked with Congressional leaders to craft a resolution authorizing him to take necessary action in Iraq to defend American national security and enforce all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. The resolution is a product of compromise that protects both congressional prerogatives and the authority of the Commander in Chief to use whatever means he determines necessary to protect American security.

The President's authority is not absolute on these matters. But he is the Commander in Chief, and he has made clear that congressional action to tie his hands, to limit the way he can respond to threats to the security of the American people, will damage our country's ability to respond to the clear and present danger posed by Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

There is a reason why the Constitution vests shared power in the President and the Congress on matters of war. But there is also a reason why the Constitution recognizes the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. Limiting the President's ability to defend the United States, when Congress and the President agree on the nature of the threat posed to the United States by Iraq, is unwise.

No resolution tying the President's hands or limiting the President's ability to respond to a clearly defined threat can anticipate the decisions the President will have to make in coming weeks and months, with American forces deployed overseas on his orders, to defend American security. We cannot foresee the course or end of this conflict, even though to most of us the threat is abundantly clear, and the course of action we must pursue is apparent. That's why there is one Commander in Chief, not 535 of them. Restricting the President's flexibility to conduct military action against a threat that has been defined and identified makes the United States less capable of responding to that threat.

Supporting the President in his role as Commander in Chief does not necessarily mean supporting the President's policy on matters of national security. In 1995, President Clinton determined to deploy American forces to Bosnia to uphold a fragile peace in a land where many said peace was not

possible. Until that time, I had serious concerns about the administration's policy in the Balkans. But once the President made his decision, I worked with Senator Bob Dole, Senator WARNER and many of my colleagues to make sure the President—a President from the other party whom we had criticized harshly for his conduct of national security policy—had the support he needed to enforce the peace in Bosnia. I think my friend Senator Dole would agree with me that it was one of the high points of our service in the Senate.

Thanks to the President's leadership over the past few months, the Congress has been moving steadily to support the President's determination to hold Saddam Hussein accountable to the world. I urge all my colleagues to renew their efforts to come together on one resolution—to show the world we are united with the President to enforce the terms of the gulf war ceasefire and prevent Saddam Hussein from threatening our and the world's security ever again.

Again, I want to thank Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator BAYH, and Senator WARNER, and I especially would like to mention Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator BAYH have shown some courage on the floor of the Senate, as Senator WARNER and I have had to do in the past, when perhaps the majority of our party may not have been in complete agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, this concludes the introduction of this matter to the Senate. I thank my friend JOHN MCCAIN for his leadership on this issue from the very beginning, as he consulted in the process with Senator LOTT and others with regard to this resolution.

If those who wish to join us would kindly indicate their expressions of support to the leaders, myself, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator LOTT. Before leaving the floor, Senator HELMS indicated his strong support, and in due course we will constitute the cosponsors of this resolution as we move forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### BIPARTISAN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2215

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I take a moment while the Senator from Alabama is here. I thank Senator SESSIONS for his statement yesterday in support of the bipartisan conference re-

port on DOJ authorization. I do that because I know he opposes a significant piece of it, Senator HATCH's legislation regarding automobile dealer arbitration, but I applaud Senator SESSIONS for reaching beyond that for the better bill, the overall bill.

I compliment his work on the conference report on the Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Improvement Grants, the Center for Domestic Preparedness in Alabama, and a number of other States.

In a hurried time, and sometimes partisan Senate, we do not take enough time to acknowledge and appreciate work done by those on the other side of the aisle. I take this moment to express my appreciation of the work of the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is the intention of Senator HATCH and I to move to suspend paragraphs 2 and 3 of rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2215, the Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act.

#### TRIBUTE TO STROM THURMOND

Mr. GRAMM. Let me also say that I put a statement in the RECORD today about STROM THURMOND. I was busy trying to deal with homeland security when we had the time to speak on STROM THURMOND. But I do want to relate one story about STROM, which is in my statement in the RECORD. When I was elected, like many new Senators do, before we went into session I brought my two sons to the Senate. I guess one of them was about 8 and one of them was about 10—or maybe 10 and 12, I lose track.

Anyway, we found my desk. So I said to my sons: Do you all want to sit in my chair? By this time they had looked around at all of the desks, and they decided they didn't want to sit in my chair. They wanted to sit in Barry Goldwater's chair and STROM THURMOND's chair.

I guess at the time, my feelings were a little hurt. But looking back, when I am sitting on the front porch of a nursing home somewhere and nobody remembers who I am or what I ever did, I am going to be able to say to myself: I knew and I served with the great STROM THURMOND. An absolutely remarkable man, not because he is 100 years old, in the Senate, but because he is forever young—not in a physical sense. My God, his physical capacities are amazing.

I remember one night, it was about 2 in the morning, we were in session. Senator BYRD was keeping us here to debate something. I was dog tired. I was talking to STROM, and he was lamenting that his brother had died because he hadn't taken care of himself and burned the candle at both ends.

I said to STROM: How old was your brother? He was 89 years old. But to STROM, that was not taking care of yourself.